



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Oleg Kiselev, John A. Colgrove  
Assignee: VERITAS Operating Corporation  
Title: AUTOMATED RECOVERY FROM DATA CORRUPTION  
OF DATA VOLUMES IN RAID STORAGE  
Application No.: 10/610,966 Filed: July 1, 2003  
Examiner: Unassigned Group Art Unit: 2186  
Docket No.: VRT0061US Confirmation No.: 1460

---

Austin, Texas  
May 24, 2004

Mail Stop Petition  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITION TO MAKE SPECIAL UNDER 37 CFR §1.102(d)**

Dear Sir:

The applicants hereby petition pursuant to 37 CFR §1.102(d) and MPEP § 708.02(VIII) to make the above-identified application special. Please charge Deposit Account No. 502306 for the fee of \$130.00 for this petition as set forth in 37 CFR §1.17(h).

Should the Office determine that all the claims presented are not obviously directed to a single invention, the applicants will make an election without traverse as a prerequisite to the grant of special status.

05/26/2004 BABRAHA1 00000127 502306 10610966  
01 FC:1460 130.00 DA

The applicants respectfully submit that a pre-examination search has been performed by a professional search firm in the following classes/subclasses:

Class	Subclasses
G06F (Electrical Digital Data Processing)	03/06 13/28 11/10 11/00 11/20 11/14 12/08 12/28 17/30 12/08
714 (Error Detection/Correction and Fault Detection/Recovery)	006 041 766 801 805
707 (Digital Processing: Database and File Management or Data Structures)	100

Enclosed are copies of the following references which are presently believed to be, from among those made of record in the accompanying Information Disclosure Statement and any previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, the most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims:

U.S. Patent Publication US 2002/0169995 A1  
U.S. Patent No. 6,606,629 B1  
U.S. Patent No. 5,948,110  
U.S. Patent No. 5,623,595  
European Application EP 0 837 393 A2

John E. Archibald Jr. et al.  
Rodney A. DeKoning et al.  
David Hitz et al.  
William Bailey  
David Gordon et al.

*Detailed Discussion of the References*

U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0169995 A1 of Archibald, Jr. et al. ("Archibald") was filed May 10, 2001 and published November 14, 2002. Archibald relates to a system, method, and computer program for selectable or programmable data consistency checking methodology. Figure 1 of Archibald illustrates a block diagram of a redundant array of independent disks (RAID) data storage system 100. Figure 2 is a block diagram that illustrates aspects of an exemplary data stripe according to Archibald.

With reference to Figures 1 and 2, Figure 3 is a flow chart that illustrates aspects of a procedure to perform data consistency checking according to the invention of Archibald. The process starts in block 302 when a data stripe is read. In block 303, 308 a first or next sector stripe is selected. Thereafter in block 304, a data check code sub-sector stripe ( $DCC_{ss}$ ) is calculated. The calculated  $DCC_{ss}$  is compared to a stored  $DCC_{ss}$  for the selected sector stripe. If the calculated  $DCC_{ss}$  is equal to the stored  $DCC_{ss}$ , then the process repeats with block 303, 308 if there are more sector stripes. If the calculated  $DCC_{ss}$  does not equal the stored  $DCC_{ss}$  for the selected sector strip, then either the stored  $DCC_{ss}$  is replaced with the calculated  $DCC_{ss}$  or an error is determined and a determination is made as to whether the error is correctable.

Paragraph 33 indicates that, with reference to Figure 2, parity header 202 includes a  $DCC_{ss}$  value derived from  $DCC_{ps}$  value in the parity header 202 and the respective  $DCC_{ds}$  values associated with the sectors. In one embodiment, the  $DCC_{ss}$  is a summation of the  $DCC_{ps}$  and the  $DCC_{ds}$  values in the sector stripe. In the preferred embodiment of Archibald, the  $DCC_{ss}$  value is an XOR of the  $DCC_{ps}$  value and the  $DCC_{ds}$  values in the sector stripe. Paragraph 36 of Archibald provides further discussion regarding  $DCC_{ds}$ . More particularly, paragraph 36 describes that the data stored in the sector body is used to generate (i) a calculated  $DCC_{ds}$  for each data sector in the sector stripe, (ii) a calculated  $DCC_{ps}$  for the parity sector in the sector stripe, and (iii) a calculated  $DCC_{ss}$  for the sector stripe based on the newly calculated  $DCC_{ds}$  and  $DCC_{ps}$ . If an inconsistency is detected between a calculated  $DCC_{ds}$  and a stored  $DCC_{ds}$  for a data sector and auto-correction for user data is enabled, the user sector body of data for the effected sector is regenerated using the remaining good data and parity sector.

The description of Archibald's invention is less than clear and a substantial argument exists as to whether Archibald is enabling and thus a prior art reference with respect to the instant application. For the purpose of this petition only, Applicants will assume that Archibald is enabling.

Independent claim 1 of the instant application recites (1) receiving a request to read data; (2) reading first parity data corresponding to first striped unit data of a first stripe in response to receiving the request; (3) generating new first parity data as a function of the first stripe unit data; (4) comparing the first parity data with the new first parity data; and (5) returning data of the first stripe unit if the first parity data compares equally to the new first parity data.

It is less than clear as to whether calculating  $DCC_{ss}$  or  $DCC_{ds}$  in Archibald equates to claim 1's step of generating new parity data as a function of the first striped unit data. Notwithstanding the lack of clarity, Applicants submit the claim 1 is nonetheless distinguishable over Archibald since it appears Archibald fails to teach or fairly suggest claim 1's steps receiving a request to read data and returning data of the first stripe unit to a computer system if the first parity data compares equally to the new first parity data. Indeed it appears nothing within Archibald indicates that the process of checking the consistency of data is initiated by a request for data contained within a stripe unit.

U.S. Patent 6,606,629 issued to DeKoning et al. ("DeKoning") on August 12, 2003. DeKoning relates to data structures containing sequence and revision number metadata used in mass storage data integrity-assuring technique. The sequence number of metadata identifies an input/output (IO) operation such as a full-stripe write on a redundant array of independent disks (RAID) mass storage system. The data structure may also contain revision number metadata which identifies a subsequent IO operation such as a read-modify-write on only a fractional component of the entire user data. The sequence number and revision number metadata are used in an error detection and correction technique, along with parity metadata to detect and correct silent errors arising from inadvertent data path and data drive corruption. An error to a portion of the stripe is detected by a difference in sequence numbers for all the components of data. An error arising after an IO operation is detected by a revision number which is different from the

correct revision number. The errors in both cases are corrected by using the parity metadata and the correct information from the other components of the user data.

Figure 10 of DeKoning illustrates operations that use sequence number and revision number metadata to detect and correct errors. The process shown in Figure 10 is initiated with a read request. In response, user data structures and parity data structures associated with read requests are read. In step 114, if returned volume and LBA metadata match with the read request and if the CRC and checksum are valid, then sequence numbers are checked for equivalency. Using the metadata of the sequence number and the revision number, in comparing the sequence and revision numbers of the user data structure with the sequence and revision numbers of the corresponding parity data structure at steps 118 and 120, respectively, it can be determined as a consequence of the read operation itself whether an error, data path corruption, or drive corruption has occurred.

While DeKoning describes use of his invention with respect to a RAID storage system, DeKoning does not teach or fairly suggest limitations (1) through (5) set forth above either alone or in combination with the remaining limitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over DeKoning.

U.S. Patent No. 5,948,110 issued to Hitz et al. ("Hitz") on September 7, 1999. Hitz relates to a method for providing parity in a RAID subsystem using non-volatile memory. Non-volatile RAM is used to increase the speed of RAID recovery from a disk error. This is accomplished by keeping a list of all disk blocks for which the parity is possibly inconsistent. Such a list of disk blocks is much smaller than the total number of parity blocks in the RAID subsystem. Figures 11A – 11C are flow diagrams illustrating the invention of heights. In Figure 11B, a determination is made in step 1104 if there are any stripes specified in a list of dirty stripes in the RAM memory. Presuming there are, blocks are read which are needed to recompute parity as shown in step 1106. Parity for the stripe is recomputed as shown in step 1107, and the new parity is written for the stripe as shown in step 1108. In Figure 11C, all disk blocks required to update a stripe are read in block 1109. In block 1110 new parity for the stripe is calculated. The stripe number of the stripe being written to is added to the list of dirty stripes in memory in step 1111.

In step 1112, disk blocks required to update the stripe are written. Finally, the stripe number of the stripe is removed from the list of dirty stripes in the memory.

While Hitz relates to providing parity in a RAID subsystem, Hitz does not teach or fairly suggest limitations (1) through (5) of claim 1 either alone or in combination with the remaining limitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submits that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Hitz.

U.S. Patent No. 5,623,595 issued to Bailey ("Bailey") on April 22, 1997. Bailey relates to a method and apparatus for transparent, real time reconstruction of corrupted data in a redundant array data storage system. In Bailey, data is read from a stripe. To read a stripe, a RAID request is sent to each storage unit in the redundancy group, requesting the block of data in that storage unit that corresponds to the stripe being read. Each storage unit independently processes its read request and sends back the requested block as soon as it has been read. Each stripe consists of  $N+1$  blocks where one of the blocks is parity. As soon as the  $N$  blocks are received, they are XOR'd together to reconstruct the outstanding  $N+1$  block. The  $N$  receipt blocks and the XOR to some, representing a reconstruction of the outstanding  $N+1$  block, are delivered to the requesting device or process.

While Bailey uses a parity RAID storage subsystem, Bailey fails to teach or fairly suggest limitations (1) through (5) of independent claim 1 either alone or in combination with the remaining limitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable.

EP Application No. 0 837 393 A2 of Gordon et al. ("Gordon") published on April 22, 1998. Gordon relates to on-line restoration of redundancy information in a redundant array system. Figure 3 is a flow chart representing the restoration process in Gordon. In block 40, an interrupted write operation for a new data block is resubmitted. The write operation is resubmitted after the write operation was interrupted. In block 41, all validated blocks in the affected stripe are read. In block 42, the new data block and the valid data blocks are XOR'd to compute the new parity block. In step 43, the new parity and new data blocks are stored in the stripe.

While Gordon relates to restoration within a RAID system, Gordon fails to teach or fairly suggest limitations (1) through (5) of independent claim 1 either alone or in combination with the remaining limitation of independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Gordon.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully requests that this petition be granted, and that the present application receive expedited examination. Should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Patent Office is requested to telephone the undersigned.

**EXPRESS MAIL NO:**  
EV 304739223 US

Respectfully submitted,



Eric A. Stephenson  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 38,321  
512-439-5093 (Phone)  
512-439-5099 (Fax)